



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,668	12/29/2000	Ali N. Salch	CIS0008P4US	7626
33031	7590	06/28/2007	EXAMINER	
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON ASCOLESE, LLP			NGUYEN, HANH N	
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD.				
BLDG. 4, SUITE 201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 78759			2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/750,668	SALEH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hanh Nguyen	2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed 6/18/07.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-152 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 48-61,64-66,68-72,75-77,79,80 and 148 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 1-47,62,63,67,73,74,78,146,147 and 151 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 113-145,150 and 152-166 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to the RCE

The RCE filed on 6/18/07 has been entered. Claims 48-61, 64-66, 68-72, 75-77, 79, 80 and 148 are withdrawn. Claims 1-47, 62, 63, 67, 73, 74, 78, 113-147, 150-166 are now pending. Claims 81-112, 149 are canceled.

Claim Objections

Claims 62, 67, 73, 78 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 62 depends on claim 61 which has been withdrawn; claim 67 depends on claim 61 which has been withdrawn; claim 73 depends on claim 72 which has been withdrawn; claim 78 depends on claim 72 which has been withdrawn;

Examiner assumes that claims 62, 67, 59, 73 and 78 now depend on their parent claim 47. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Regarding claims 113, 160, the word "means" is preceded by the word(s) indicated in lines "2, 4, 7, 10, 12, 14, 16" in an attempt to use a "means" clause to recite a claim element as a means for performing a specified function. However, since no function is specified by the word(s) preceding "means," it is impossible to determine the equivalents of the element, as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. See *Ex parte Klumb*, 159 USPQ 694 (Bd. App. 1967).

Claims 114-145, 150, 152, 161-166 are rejected because they depend on claims 113 and 160 respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 113-145, 150, 152-166 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bentall et al. (US pat. 6,282,170 B1) in view of Croslin et al. et al. (US pat. 5,737,319).

In claims 113, 160, Bentall et al. discloses a method for restoring a virtual path (select a restoration route) in an optical network (see abstract and col.6, lines 35-37; col.3, lines 25-30), the method comprising broadcasting a plurality of resource request packets to a plurality of nodes in the optical network (fig.3, step 100; col.5, lines 48-52; sending messages along alternate routes to determine capacity of each link of the alternate routes through a network); dynamically identifying a plurality of nodes with resources, as a result of said broadcasting, necessary to support the virtual path (see fig.9, col.7, line 60 to col.8, line 25; in response to receiving flood messages, chooser node assigns spare capacity on virtual paths and acknowledges each virtual path with sufficient capacity); identifying an intermediate node without /lacking resources necessary to support the virtual path (see fig.9, step 144, col.8, lines 20-24; by updating database of alternative routes at the chooser node, the chooser node identifies virtual paths that lack of spare capacity on the alternate routes. It is inherent that once the VP lack of capacity, nodes located on the VP also lack of capacity; see further in col.9, lines 30-35);

and resource for the VP is rejected dynamically determining an alternate physical path comprising ones of the nodes with resources (fig.4, steps 113 & 114; select one of the alternative routes and allocate capacity on this selected alternative route; see col.5, line 62 to col.6, line 5); configuring the alternate physical path by establishing a communication connection between the nodes with resources (fig.9; step 142; col.8, lines 15-18; a shortest route with sufficient capacity is acknowledged to the sender); and restoring the virtual path by provisioning the virtual path over said alternate physical path (see fig.11, col.9, lines 35-45; sender re-routes the virtual path along the selected route when the route acknowledgement is received).

Even though Bentall et al. does not explicitly disclose dynamically determining an alternate physical path; but Bentall discloses the nodes are interrogated to gather information for possible routes without having to preplan for preferred routes (see col.3, lines 8-15). In order to show that dynamically determining an alternate phycal path is a well-known skill in the art, Croslin disclose, in its Relate Art, col.1, lines 50-65 and col.2, lines 40-47, that if a transmission segment suddenly become severed, dynamic network restoral application directs switching elements to select one of alternate transmission segments to replace the severed one, wherein the replaced transmission segment has enough resources to support the network transmission without disconnecting (dynamically identify nodes and dynamically determining an alternate path with sufficient resource). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to apply the dynammic network restoral application of Croslin et al. with the network restoral of Bentall et al. so that network restoral is performed in real time and dynamically. The motivation is to avoid the dependend of the limit preplanned routes and reduce the time delay.

In claims 151, 152, Bentall et al. discloses ascertaining whether the intermediate node without resources lacks a resource necessary to support the virtual path (with the discussion in claim 1 and 113, chooser node updates its database to determine VPs that are lack of capacity).

In claim 114, Bentall et al. discloses detecting a failure in the virtual path (fig.4, step 110; col.5, lines 60-65).

In claim 115, Bentall et al. discloses the detection of the failure is done by receiving a failure message packet (fig.9, step 140, receiving flood messages); dynamically identifying nodes with resources comprises acknowledging the failure message (fig.9, step 142; acknowledging shortest route for each path with sufficient capacity by sending message back to sender. Note that route with sufficient capacity inherently includes nodes coupled therewith);

In claims 116 and 117, the limitations of these claims have been addressed in claim 1.

In claims 118, 126 and 137, Bentall et al. discloses restoring the VP (the restoration functions) is performed by the first node/intermediate node (fig.2; sender node 63), an intermediate node (chooser node 64; fig.2). See col.6, lines 20-25.

In claims 119, 127 and 138, Bentall et al. discloses in claim 1 that a failure of a route connecting two nodes results in a new selected alternate route inherently changes the failed port associated with the failed route) and update the provisioning in the node data base (see fig.9, step 143; col.8, lines 20-25). For further clarification, application is directed to fig.5, col.6, lines 10-55 which address the claimed limitations:

the failure is a local physical port port between an intermediate node and an adjacent node; determining a different port of a link (see fig.5, col.6, lines 10-55; routing table in database

74 indicates which link is used by an appropriate VP); initiating a physical port switch request (switching function 71 refers to routing table to pass communication between links); provisioning the VP to the different physical port (reroute to alternative route would inherently switch to another physical port).

In claims 135, 144, Bental et al. discloses if said intermediary node receives a valid restore path request, updating path information in a node database (fig.9, step 143), allocating resources requested for said virtual path (fig.9, step 142), and forwarding said restore path request to all eligible adjacent nodes (fig.9, step 144).

In claims 35, 46, 136 and 145, Bental et al. discloses if the intermediary node receives an invalid restore path request, responding with a negative acknowledgement (fig.9, step 144; means that a node uses all resources to restore a failed VP until all VPs are block. Inherently, when VPs are block due to insufficient resources, a Negative acknowledgement should be received; see col.8, lines 20-25).

In claims 120-125, 128, 129, 139 and 140, the limitations of these claims have been addressed in claim 1 because as the original VP is failed, it is most likely that the alternative routes is required with previous steps performed in indepedent claims 1, 47, 891 and 113. When an alternative routes in Bental is setup with sufficient capacity, it is inherent that the alternative routes has to be routed via different links having different ports (See col.8, lines 27-35; any new VPs to be setup during the duration of the link failure would be rerouted to avoid the failed part). Bental et al. discloses the alarm raised to commence restoration (see fig.8). It is a well-known skill in to art to raise alarm periodically between a first time period , a second time period depend on how bad the traffic conditions. Motivation would be prevent critical network failures.

In claims 131-134, 142 and 143, the limitations of these claims have been addressed in claim 1.

In claim 150, with the limitations that have been discussed in claims 1 and 113, Bentel et al. further discloses receiving an allocation request at an intermediate node (see fig. 10, step 149; tandem node receiving flood message from sender); if said resource necessary to support said virtual path is available on said intermediate node, allocating said resource necessary to support said virtual path on said intermediate node (see fig. 10, step 153; tandem nodes reserves spare capacity for restoration process); forwarding said allocation request from said tandem node (see fig. 10, step 154, tandem node broadcasts message on all links) (see col.8, line 65 to col.9, line 27), and, if said resource necessary to support said virtual path is unavailable on said intermediate node, returning a negative response from said intermediate node (see col.9, lines 30-35; if there is no capacity to be assigned, the tandem node will pass the message to the chooser node to reflect that there is a lack of spare capacity).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim 153, 157-159 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Callon et al. (US pat. 5,854,899).

In claims 153, 158 and 159, examiner finds that the claimed “optical network” and “restoring virtual path” in the preamble are not shown in the body of the claim. Therefore, examiner does not consider the two elements. In addition, the claimed “preventing the resource request packet from being forwarded” is broadly interpreted as “buffering the packet while new VC is being determined”

Callon et al. discloses receiving a resource request packet at an intermediate node wherein said resource request packet is configured for broadcast in said optical network (see fig.9; steps 236 & 238, col.15, lines 35-40; finding new paths to destination due to existing virtual circuit fails); dynamically determining whether said intermediate node has a resource necessary to support said virtual path (fig.9, step 240; col.15, lines 40-50; analysing the unreachable nodes to determine whether they had any reachable neighbors, and if so they are considered as reachable nodes); if said intermediate node has said resource necessary to support said virtual path, forwarding said resource request packet (see fig.4, steps 152&154; if there is an existing efficient VC, packet is forwarded via the efficient VC; col.7, lines 50-67) and if said intermediate node lacks said resource necessary to support said virtual path, preventing said resource request packet from being forwarded (still in fig.4, steps 152 & 156; buffering the packet).

Claims 157 and 158 has been disclosed in claim 153.

Claim 154-156 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callon et al. (US pat. 5,854,899) in view of Nederlof (US pat. 5,590,118).

Claims 154, 155, 156, Callon et al. does not disclose a negative acknowledgement message is returned to an original node; the resource request packet comprises fields for identifying at least one previously traversed link and a hop count field. Nederlof discloses in fig.1, col.9, line 50 to col.10, line 60; as a request message is transmitted from node SN1 on each of its links L12, L14 and L15 for restoration when a link L19 connected to node SN1 is failed. The request message comprises hop count field HOPCT (a hop count field); IDA field with value of 1 indicating address of the switching node that detects the failure and transmits the request (fields for identifying at least one previously traversed link). Nederlof further discloses a RELREQIN message. The RELREQIN is transmitted from a switching node that receives a request message to the switching node that originates the request message to indicate that there is no sufficient bandwidth on links connected to the switching node which received the request packet (see col.12, lines 1-20; a negative acknowledgement message is returned to an original node). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art to apply the teachings of Nederlof into Callon et al. to notify the transmitting node that the resource in the network is not available and the transmitting node needs to stop transmitting or reroute the transmitting which will prevent the network from being congested. In addition, by looking at the hop count the request packet, the best minimum hops VP can be determined.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1 and 47 are allowed.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Phaltankar (US Pat. 6,714,549 B1).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh Nguyen whose telephone number is 571 272 3092. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 to 4:30. The examiner can also be reached on alternate.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Field, can be reached on 571 272 2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh Nguyen



HANH NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER